## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s) BECKER, BURKHARD	
10/730,619		
Examiner	Art Unit	
YONG CHOE	2185	

	YONG CHOE	2185	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addi	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>20 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid aban t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07()	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date.	of the fee. The approprianally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a control NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>	:		·
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		•	-
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: 9,10,16 and 17. Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,5-8,11-15 and 18-23. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an ex	planation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	to provide a
<ul> <li>10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> <li>11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been consideration because:</li> </ul>			
See Continuation Sheet.  12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). ( 13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Gary J Portka/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2188	

Application No.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed on 06/20/2008 have been fully consider but they are not persuasive. For example, Regarding applicant's remarks on page 2-4, applicants argue that none of the cited references provide any teaching or suggestion to employ an icrementation rule or a decrementation rule for computing addresses. In response, it is well know to one of ordinary skill in the art that the Arithmetic Logic Unit (ALU) must provide the arithmetic computation basic rules such as incrementation or decrementation rule in order to compute data, address, etc." Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the base address as taught by Tipon et al. with transmitting data of a plurality of data types between a digital processor and a hardware arithmetic-logic unit of Hess to obtain the invention.